

SECTION III—REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed September 8, 2004. In this amendment claims 10, 27, 33 and 38 are amended. Claims 10, 12-17 and 27-38 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of all pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 12-17 and 27-38 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as obvious in view of, and therefore unpatentable over, various combinations of the following references: U.S. Patent No. 6,607,812 to Martin (“Martin”); U.S. Patent No. 6,273,986 to Egan (“Egan”); U.S. Patent No. 6,671,611 to Peltier (“Peltier”); U.S. Patent No. 4,585,254 to Adams (“Adams”); U.S. Patent No. 6,088,212 to Freund *et al.* (“Freund”); and U.S. Patent No. 6,363,423 to Chiles *et al.* (“Chiles”).

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner’s rejections. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met: (1) the prior art references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations; (2) some suggestion or motivation to combine the references must be found in the prior art; and (3) there must be a reasonable expectation of success. MPEP § 2143. As explained below, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

The Examiner rejected claim 10 as unpatentable over Martin in view of Egan. Claim 10 recites a method combination including reading a unique identifier stored on a component, printing the unique identifier read from the component onto first and second labels, and removably affixing the first and second labels to a component container into which the component is inserted, “wherein the first and second labels are removably affixed immediately after printing.” Martin and Egan, alone or combined, do not disclose a combination including the recited limitations. The Examiner concedes that Martin does not disclose, teach or suggest removably affixing labels. Martin also does not disclose that labels bearing identifying information read from an item should be attached to a container in which the item is placed immediately after the information is printed on the labels. Likewise, Egan discloses only overlaying a label containing shipping information on a label containing a packing list. Egan does not disclose, teach or suggest that labels with identifying information should be attached to

a container in which the item is placed immediately after the information is read from the item and printed on the labels. Martin and Egan, taken alone or together, therefore do not disclose, teach or suggest a method combination including the recited limitations. Applicant submits that claim 10 is therefore allowable and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding claims 12-17, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12-17 are therefore allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 10 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 27 as unpatentable over Martin in view of Egan and further in view of Chiles. Claim 27 recites a process combination including reading a Media Access Control (MAC) address from a network interface card, wherein the MAC address is stored in the network interface card and uniquely identifies the network interface card, “printing the MAC address on a first label and a second label in a machine-readable or human-readable format,” and removably affixing the first and second labels to a component container into which the network interface card can be inserted, “wherein the first and second labels are removably affixed immediately after printing.” Martin and Egan are discussed above, and the Examiner cites Chiles only for its disclosure of a Media Access Control (MAC) number. Therefore, by analogy to the discussion above for claim 10, Martin, Egan and Chiles, taken alone or together, cannot disclose, teach or suggest a combination including the recited limitations. Applicant submits that claim 27 is therefore allowable and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding claims 28-32, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 27 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28-32 are therefore allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 27 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

The Examiner rejected claim 33 as unpatentable over Martin in view of Egan and further in view of Chiles. Claim 33 recites a method combination including reading a Media Access

Control (MAC) address from a network interface card, wherein the MAC address is stored in the network interface card and uniquely identifies the network interface card, printing the MAC address on a first identification label and a second identification label in a machine-readable or human-readable format, removably affixing the first and second identification labels to a base label having a designated area thereon to receive a plurality of identification labels, “wherein the first and second identification labels are removably affixed immediately after printing” and “immediately affixing the base label to a component container into which the network interface card can be inserted.” Martin and Egan are discussed above, and the Examiner cites Chiles only for its disclosure of a Media Access Control (MAC) number. Therefore, by analogy to the discussion above for claim 27, Martin, Egan and Chiles, taken alone or together, cannot disclose, teach or suggest a combination including the recited limitations. Applicant submits that claim 33 is therefore allowable and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Regarding claims 34-38, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is also non-obvious. MPEP § 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). As discussed above, claim 33 is in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 34-38 are therefore allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claim 10 and by virtue of the features recited therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of these claims.

Conclusion

Given the above amendments and accompanying remarks, all claims pending in the application are in condition for allowance. If the undersigned attorney has overlooked a teaching in any of the cited references that is relevant to allowance of the claims, the Examiner is requested to specifically point out where such teaching may be found. Further, if there are any informalities or questions that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (206) 292-8600.

Charge Deposit Account

Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fee(s) that may be due in this matter, and please credit the same deposit account for any overpayment.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1-6-05

Todd M. Becker
Todd M. Becker
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,487

Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles CA 90025-1030
Phone: 206-292-8600
Facsimile: 206-292-8606

Enclosures: Postcard
Amendment transmittal, in duplicate
Check